

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,359	01/18/2002	Mitsuru Asano	09792909-5303	9291
26263 7590 07/02/2007 SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080			· EXAMINER	
			KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K	
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080		STOWER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			. 07/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/051,359	ASANO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Srilakshmi K. Kumar	2629
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory is a failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re on. Deriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. Sply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for al closed in accordance with the practice un	This action is non-final. It is action is non-final. It is action is non-final matter.	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	hdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to be the drawing(s) be held in abeyand orrection is required if the drawing(s)	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. Certified copies of the priority documents. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for the certified copies.	ments have been received. ments have been received in Ap priority documents have been uureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	8) Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/051,359 Page 2

Art Unit: 2629

DETAILED ACTION

The following is in response to the Request for Continued Examination, filed on April 16, 2007. Claims 1-7 are pending. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al (US 6,351,327 B1) in view of Brody (US 4,982,273) and further in view of Matsuo et al (US 5,414,547).

As to independent claim 1, Kimura et al disclose an organic electroluminescent display (col. 19, line 66-col. 20, line 7, and Fig. 1, item 100) having active matrix circuitry (col. 20, lines 9-25), the organic electroluminescence display comprising; a substrate (Fig. 1, item 1); a device layer provided on the substrate (col. 20, lines 20-25), the device layer comprising a plurality of luminescent devices (Fig. 1, item 224) defining pixel units (Fig. 1, item 10) arrayed in a matrix (Fig. 1, col. 20, lines 26-40), each luminescent device having an emitting area that emits independently of the emitting areas of the other luminescent devices (col. 1, lines 39-44, where in Fig. 1, item 224 shows the individual luminescent device per pixel independent from other pixel emitting areas); a circuitry layer provided between the substrate (Fig. 1) and the device layer, the circuitry layer comprising pixel circuits for driving the respective luminescent devices (col. 1, lines 24-58), the pixel circuits defining the pixel units (Fig. 1, item 10, col. 20, lines 26-

Art Unit: 2629

40); Kimura et al do not disclose contacts, electrically connecting each of the luminescent devices with a corresponding pixel circuit. Brody discloses contacts (Figs 4b and 4c, item 27, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, lines 18), where in Fig. 4b, the contacts (27) are shown to be at the edges of the emitting areas. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the contacts of Brody into Kimura et al as the contacts for the row or column of the display as disclosed by Brody in col. 2, lines 65-col. 3, lines 20 improve image quality. Kimura et al as modified by Brody do not disclose wherein the contact is provided between adjacent emitting areas of the luminescent devices. Matsuo et al disclose a display device comprising contacts (Fig. 24, item 207) wherein the contact is provided between adjacent emitting areas (201bb, 201cb, etc. being the pixel emitting areas, and the contacts being provided in between the pixel areas). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the contacts between adjacent emitting as taught by Matsuo et al into Kimura et al as modified by Brody as the having the contacts provided between the adjacent emitting areas increases the emitting/display area (Matsuo et al, col. 2, lines 45-68).

As to independent claim 6, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, Kimura et al disclose an organic layer including a luminescent layer and lying between the upper electrode and the lower electrode (col. 20, lines 26-40). Kimura et al do not disclose wherein each lower electrode has a contact electrically connecting the corresponding luminescent device with the corresponding pixel circuit, and wherein the upper electrode is not provided over the contact. Brody discloses wherein each lower electrode has a contact electrically connecting the corresponding luminescent device with the corresponding pixel circuit (Figs 4b and 4c, item 27, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, lines 18), and wherein the upper electrode is not provided over the contact, Art Unit: 2629

as in Fig. 4b, the contacts (27) are shown to be at the edges of the emitting areas. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the contacts of Brody into Kimura et al as the contacts for the row or column of the display as disclosed by Brody in col. 2, lines 65-col. 3, lines 20 improve image quality. Kimura et al as modified by Brody do not disclose wherein the contact is provided between adjacent emitting areas of the luminescent devices. Matsuo et al disclose a display device comprising contacts (Fig. 24, item 207) wherein the contact is provided between adjacent emitting areas (201bb, 201cb, etc. being the pixel emitting areas, and the contacts being provided in between the pixel areas). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the contacts between adjacent emitting as taught by Matsuo et al into Kimura et al as modified by Brody as the having the contacts provided between the adjacent emitting areas increases the emitting/display area (Matsuo et al, col. 2, lines 45-68).

As to dependent claim 2, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, Brody discloses a flat screen color display comprising an active matrix and wherein the contacts are arrayed in a single dimension for each row or column in the matrix in Figs. 4a and 7 and in col. 7, line 54-col. 8, lines 18.

As to dependent claim 3, limitations of claim 2, and further comprising, Brody discloses a flat screen color display comprising an active matrix and wherein the contacts for the pixel units belonging to two adjacent rows or columns in the matrix are arrayed in a single dimension between the two adjacent rows or columns in Figs. 4a and 7 and in col. 7, line 54-col. 8, lines 18.

As to dependent claim 4, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, Kimura et al disclose wherein the luminescent devices are organic electroluminescent devices (col. 20, lines

Art Unit: 2629

29-30), each comprising a first electrode, a second electrode and an organic layer including an luminescent layer and lying between the first electrode and the second electrode (col. 20, lines 41-62).

As to dependent claims 5 and 7, limitations of claims 1 and 6, and further comprising, Kimura et al disclose wherein the pixel circuits (Fig. 1, item 10) each comprise a thin film transistor (Fig. 1, item 223, col. 20, lines 26-40).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srilakshmi K. Kumar whose telephone number is 571 272 7769. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Lefkowitz can be reached on 571 272 3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/051,359 Page 6

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Srilakshmi K Kumar Examiner Art Unit 2629

SKK

June 18, 2007

SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER